### REMARKS

# Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claim 24 because of an informality. However, it is believed that the amendment of Claim 24 renders the objection moot.

## 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph: Claims 16 and 17

The Examiner rejected Claims 16 and 17 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention. In explaining this rejection, the Examiner indicated that the unit "litres per hectare" used in Claims 16 and 17 is not a rate. The Examiner asserted that the term "rate" means a degree or unit per time and the claims recite a unit per area, thereby rendering the claims to be indefinite.

The Examiner's objection is not based on substantial evidence and is clearly erroneous. Attached to this response is an excerpt from *The New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary of the English Language* which shows the definition of the term "rate" as "the amount of something in relation to some other thing." The entry also provides the following usage example: "absentee rate of 3 men and 5 women per 1,000 employees".

In view of the well-known definition and well-accepted usage of the term "rate" evidenced by the attached dictionary excerpt, the Examiner's limited definition of "rate" is clearly erroneous. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 16 and 17 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112 is not supported by substantial evidence and should be withdrawn.

### 35 USC 102(b): Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 20-21, 24, 25-27, 29, and 35

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 20-21, 24, 25-27, 29, and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,297,730 (Thompson). In making this rejection the Examiner asserted that Thompson anticipates the rejected claims because it discloses a method for killing weeds using heat and a liquid component.

The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish-derived or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 35 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying oil onto the heated weeds. Thus, in the Applicant's claimed method heat is applied first, and then the herbicide or other substance is applied. In contrast, the process described in Thompson preheats an herbicidal liquid and then applies the heated liquid to the weeds or other vegetation. Therefore, the method described in Thompson is not the same as the Applicant's claimed method.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 14, 20, and 21 depend from Claim 1 and thus, include all of the steps and features set forth in Claim 1. Claims 25-27, and 29 depend from Claim 24 and thus, include all of the steps set forth in Claim 24. In view of the differences between Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 20-21, 24, 25-27, 29, and 35 and the process described in Thompson, it is clear that the Applicant's claimed process is novel relative to Thompson. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 14, 20-21, 24, 25-27, 29, and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

### 35 USC 102(b): Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 35

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2001/0000554 (Prull). In making this rejection the Examiner asserted that Prull anticipates the rejected claims because it discloses a method for killing weeds using heat and a liquid component.

The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance containing an herbicide or fish-derived or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The

Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 35 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying oil onto the heated weeds. Thus, in the Applicant's claimed method, heat is applied first and then the herbicidal substance is applied. In contrast, the process described in Prull applies water to the weeds and then applies high heat to the moistened weeds. Therefore, the method described in Prull is not the same as the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in any of Claims 1, 24, or 35.

To the extent that the Examiner is relying on Prull's description of the secondary water sprayer, such reliance is misplaced. Prull clearly teaches that the secondary sprayer is for the purpose of preventing fires and thus, is only used as needed for such purpose. Prull neither describes nor suggests that water provided from the secondary sprayer provides any weed killing functionality. Moreover, the Examiner's assertion that water is an herbicide in the context of the Prull disclosure is unreasonable. Considered as a whole, Prull teaches the use of heat to kill weeds. In the process described in Prull, the weeds are pre-wetted with water to enhance heat transfer. The water itself has no herbicidal function. The Examiner's position is patently unreasonable because if water were an herbicide no vegetation would survive a rainstorm.

In any event, Claim 35 includes the step of applying oil to the weeds immediately after the heating step. Prull does not describe or suggest such a step.

Claims 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, and 22 depend from Claim 1 and thus, include all of the steps set forth in Claim 1. Claims 26 and 28 depend from Claim 24 and thus, include all of the steps set forth in Claim 24. In view of the differences between Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 35 and the process described in Prull, it is clear that the Applicant's claimed process is novel relative to Prull. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 18, 21, 22, 24, 26, 28, and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

# 35 USC 102(b): Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-22, 24-27, 29, and 30

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-22, 24-27, 29, and 30 under 35 USC 102(b) as

being anticipated by US 5,946,851 (Adey et al.). In making the rejection the Examiner stated, in pertinent part, "Adey et al. disclose a method for killing weeds using hot air. The temperature for killing the weeds ranges from 100°C to 900°C (col. 2, lines 19-22). The hot air is added to the weeds followed immediately by the water to inhibit burning or flaming of the weeds foliage. Alternatively, the heated water may be added to the foliage followed by heating with water."

The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. Thus, in the Applicant's claimed method heat is applied first, and then the herbicide or other substance is applied. In contrast, the process described in Adey et al. applies water to the weeds simultaneously with the application of heat. Therefore, the method described in Adey et al. is not the same as the Applicant's claimed method.

Moreover, the Examiner's assertions do not fairly describe the process of Adey et al. The relevant text is set forth at column 1, line 28, to column 2, line 15, and at column 2, line 46, to column 3, line 8. It is clear from that text that the process described in Adey et al. involves simultaneous application of heat and moisture, contrary to the Examiner's assertions. Moreover, Adey et al. does not describe the use of an herbicide after the weeds are heated. As discussed above, the Examiner's assertion that water is an herbicide is unreasonable. Considered as a whole, Adey et al. teaches the use of heat to kill weeds. In the process described in Adey et al., the weeds are wetted simultaneously with water to enhance heat transfer. The water itself has no herbicidal function. As noted previously, the Examiner's position is patently unreasonable because if water were an herbicide no vegetation would survive a rainstorm.

Claims 2-4, 6-8, and 16-18, 21, and 22 depend from Claim 1 and thus, include all of the steps set forth in Claim 1. Claims 19 and 20 have been cancelled, thereby mooting the rejection as to those claims. Claims 25-27, 29, and 30 depend from Claim 24 and thus, include all of the

steps set forth in Claim 24. In view of the differences between Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-18, 21, 24-27, 29, and 30 and the process described in Adey et al., it is clear that the Applicant's claimed process is novel relative to Adey et al. Accordingly, the rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-18, 21, 24-27, 29, and 30 under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

## 35 USC 103(a): Claims 15 and 36

The Examiner rejected Claims 15 and 36 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of US 2,867,519 (Bartlett et al.). In making the rejection the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to use an herbicidal grease composition as described by Bartlett et al. in the process described in Thompson.

Claim 15 depends from Claim 1 indirectly through Claim 14. Therefore, Claim 15 is interpreted to include all of the steps and features set forth in Claim 1. As discussed hereinabove, the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds, or other matter to be killed, to heat and then immediately thereafter applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish-derived or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. Thus, Claim 15 is directed to the Applicant's claimed process wherein the liquid substance includes a fish oil. Claim 36 is a dependent claim that refers back to Claim 35 and includes all of the steps and features of that claim. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 35 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying oil onto the heated weeds. Thus, in both Claims 15 and 36 the Applicant's claimed method requires that heat is applied first, and then the herbicidal substance is applied.

In contrast, the process described in Thompson preheats the herbicidal liquid and then applies the heated liquid to the weeds or other vegetation. Therefore, even if the herbicidal composition described in Bartlett et al. were used in the process described in Thompson, the resulting process would not be the same as the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in either Claim 15 or Claim 36. Since the proposed combination would not include all of the steps and features of Claim 15 or Claim 36, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of those claims should be withdrawn.

### 35 USC 103(a): Claims 9-12 and 31-34

The Examiner rejected Claims 9-12 and 31-34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of US 6,759,370 (Innes). In making the rejection the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to use monterpene as described by Innes as an herbicide in the process described in Thompson.

Claims 9-12 depend from Claim 1 indirectly through Claim 8. Therefore, Claims 9-12 are interpreted to include all of the steps and features set forth in Claim 1. As discussed hereinabove, the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weeds to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. Thus, Claims 9-12 are directed to the Applicant's claimed process wherein the liquid substance includes a terpene-based herbicide (Claim 9), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid based component (Claim 10), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid soap (Claim 11), and a terpene-based herbicide, a fatty acid soap, and a foaming agent (Claim 12).

Claims 31-34 are dependent claims that refer back to Claim 24 and thus, include all of the steps and features of that claim. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claims 31-34 includes the use of a terpene-based herbicide (Claim 31), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid based component (Claim 32), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid soap (Claim 33), and a terpene-based herbicide, a fatty acid soap, and a foaming agent (Claim 34).

Thus, in Claims 9-12 as well as in Claims 31-34, the Applicant's claimed method requires that heat is applied first, and then the herbicide or other substance is applied.

In contrast, the process described in Thompson preheats the herbicidal liquid and then

applies the heated liquid to the weeds or other vegetation. Therefore, even if the herbicidal composition described in Innes were used in the process described in Thompson, the resulting process would not be the same as the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claims 9-12 or in Claims 31-34. Since the proposed combination would not include all of the steps and features of Claims 9-12 or Claims 31-34, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of those claims should be withdrawn.

### 35 USC 103(a): Claims 9-12 and 31-34

The Examiner rejected Claims 9-12 and 31-34 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adey et al in view of Innes. In making the rejection the Examiner asserted that it would have been obvious to use monterpene as described by Innes as an herbicide in the process described in Adey et al.

Claims 9-12 depend from Claim 1 through Claim 8. Therefore, Claims 9-12 are interpreted to include all of the steps and features set forth in Claim 1. As discussed hereinabove, the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 1 includes the steps of exposing weed to heat and then immediately applying a liquid substance that includes an herbicide or a fish- or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. Thus, Claims 9-12 are directed to the Applicant's claimed process wherein the liquid substance includes a terpene-based herbicide (Claim 9), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid based component (Claim 10), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid soap (Claim 11), and a terpene-based herbicide, a fatty acid soap, and a foaming agent (Claim 12).

Claims 31-34 are dependent claims that refer back to Claim 24 and thus, include all of the steps and features of that claim. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claim 24 includes the steps of exposing weeds to be killed to heat, and then immediately applying a liquid herbicide or a fish or animal-derived substance to the heated weeds. The Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claims 31-34 includes the use of a terpene-based herbicide (Claim 31), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid based component (Claim 32), a terpene-based herbicide and a fatty acid soap (Claim 33), and a terpene-based herbicide, a fatty acid soap, and a foaming

agent (Claim 34).

Thus, in Claims 9-12 as well as in Claims 31-34, the Applicant's claimed method requires that heat is applied first, and then the herbicide or other substance is applied.

In contrast, the process described in Adey et al. applies the water simultaneously with heated air to the weeds or other vegetation. Therefore, even if the herbicidal composition described in Innes were used in the process described in Adey et al., the resulting process would not be the same as the Applicant's claimed method as set forth in Claims 9-12 or in Claims 31-34. Since the proposed combination would not include all of the steps and features of Claims 9-12 or Claims 31-34, the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of those claims should be withdrawn.

## Prima facie Obviousness

The Examiner asserted that it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is known to be useful for the same purpose. The Applicant does not believe that the references cited by the Examiner either alone or in combination render the claimed method *prima facie* obvious. Nevertheless, the Applicant notes that there is evidence of unexpected results presented in the present application.

An important advantage of the Applicant's claimed method is provided by the sequence in which the method is performed. As described at page 6, lines 17-20, of the present application, the Applicant believes that exposure to heat, such as the blast of hot air, breaks down the outer membrane or cellular structure of weeds so that the liquid substance which is sprayed onto the weeds immediately thereafter can more effectively penetrate into or coat the weeds. A more effective kill is achieved. Moreover, where the liquid substance is an herbicide, a substantially lower volume of the herbicide can be used which provides important economic benefits and in some cases environmental benefits through lower chemical use.

Set forth at pages 11 and 12 of the present application are the results of comparative testing of the Applicant's claimed method for killing/controlling weeds. As described therein, an

application of heat and an herbicide in accordance with the claimed method was compared to the use of heat alone and an herbicide alone. The data presented in Table 2 show that the Applicant's method was significantly more effective in preventing regrowth of the weeds up to as long as 90 days compared to the known treatments applied individually. There is no disclosure or suggestion of such an effect in any of the references cited by the Examiner. Accordingly, to the extent that a *prima facie* case of obviousness may be presented by the combinations of references cited by the Examiner, it is believed that the results presented in Table 2 rebut the Examiner's assertions.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of the present application in the light of the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL AND SKILLMAN A Professional Corporation Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Vincent T. Pace

PTO Registration No. 31,049

Tel.: 215-563-4100 Fax: 215-563-4044

email: vpace@ddhs.com

Attachment

# THE NEW LEXICON WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY

OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

1988 EDITION

LEXICON PUBLICATIONS, INC.
NEW YORK

Ras-tatt, Treaty of (ráftat) a treaty (1714) between Austria and France at the end of the War of the Spanish Succession, complementing the Peace of Utrecht (1713)

raster (ræster) n. the part in the cathode-ray tube of a television set on which the image is reproduced [G.=screen]

raster display (computer) a graphic presenta-tion of data created on a screen in fixed

sequence, usu. from left to right at (ræt) 1. n. any of various omnivorous rodents rat (ræt) I. n. any of various omnivorous rodents of Rattus and related genera of fam. Muridae. They are approximately 8 ins long with a scaly tail 8-9 ins in length. Rats live in drains, sewers and rubbish piles and have spread throughout the world on ships. They are highly destructive and are the carriers of many diseases, esp. bubonic plague || (pop.) a contemptible person, esp. one who betrays or deserts associates || a tapered coil, esp. of hair, over which a woman's hair may be arranged || to smell a rat to suspect some trap, piece of trickwhich a woman's nair may be arranged || to smell a rat to suspect some trap, piece of trickery, treachery etc. 2. v. pres. part. rat-ting past and past part. rat-ted v.i. to hunt rats || (often with 'on') to desert or betray one's associates [O E roet]

ra-ta (ráta) n. either of two New Zealand trees, Metrosideros robusta and M. lucida, fam. Myr taceae, yielding a hard, red wood | this wood [Maori]

ratable, rateable (réitab'l) adj. liable to be rated | able to be rated in accordance with some scale rateably, rate-a-bly adv.

rat-a-fi-a (rætəfi:ə) n. a liqueur flavored with almonds or with peach, apricot or cherry kernels

[F., origin unknown] rat-al (reit'l) n. (Br.) the amount on which local property taxes are assessed ratan \*RATTAN

20

rat-bite fever a febrile disease caused by the bacterium Spirillum minus and transmitted by the bite of a rat. An ulcer forms at the site of the wound, the lymph glands swell, and there is usually a bluish-red rash

ratch (ræts) n. a ratchet | a toothed bar with which a pawl engages to prevent reverse mo-

ratch-et (rætsit) n. a detent, catch or pawl for retaining or activating a ratchet wheel | a ratchet wheel and pawl working together | (Br.) the notched, tapering teeth set on certain wheels and bars which may engage with a pawl to prevent reverse motion [F. rochet, lance head hobbinl

ratchet wheel a wheel having teeth with which a detent, catch or pawl engages to prevent reverse motion or to activate forward motion

rate (reit) 1. n. the amount of something in relation to some other thing, absentee rate of 2 men and 5 women per 1,000 employees || a fixed ratio between two things, quantities etc., rate of exchange || speed of motion or change, drive at a moderate rate || (pl., Br.) a local property tax levid on buildings. ied on buildings etc. in proportion to an esti-mated annual rental value | a fixed charge per unit of a commodity, service etc. | (insurance) a premium charge per unit | a charge asked or paid for a service etc. || (naut.) a class of vessel, esp. of warships at any rate at least, in any case, at any rate he didn't forget at this (or that) rate given the present (or those) conditions 2. v. pres. part. rating past and past part. ratied v.t. to assess the quality or worth of || (Br.) to assess (property) for local tax purposes || to consider (someone or something) as something, they rate him as a public menace || to deserve, merit, this essay rates a low grade  $\|$  (naut.) to determine the relative rank or class of  $\|v.i.$  to be considered, he rates as a fine workman [O.F.]

rate (reit) pres. part. rating past and past part. rated v.t. to scold severely v.i. (usually with 'at') to deliver a scolding [etym. doubtful] rateable \*RATABLE .\.

ra-tel (réit'l) n. a member of Mellivora, fam. Mustelidae, a genus of burrowing carnivores, esp. M. capensis of S. Africa and M. indica of India. Ratels are about 3 ft long, including an 8-9-in. tail, and have thick coarse fur, gray on top and black-inderneath. They destroy wild bees nests for their honey [Afrik.] rate-me-ter (reitmiter) n. an instrument that indicates the rate at which radiation is being absorbed by a human

absorbed by a human rater (reiter) n. (only in compounds) a person of

rater (reter) n. tony in compounds, a person of a certain class or rating, a second-rater rather (ræðer, róðer) adv. more willingly, preferably, we would rather go for a walk than stay indoors | more truthfully, more exactly, it was a

foolish rather than a malicious remark | on the contrary, it wasn't damp, rather it was too dry || in some measure, he is rather tiresome || (ræðé:r, račé:r) (Br., pop., in answering a question) yes, most certainly [comp. of older rathe, quickly] raticide (ratisaid) n. a chemical or other prep-

aration for exterminating rats [fr. RAT+L. caedere, to kill!

rati-fi-ca-tion (rætifikéijen) n. a ratifying or

being ratified rati-fy (ratified) pres. part. rati-fy-ing past and past part. rati-fied v.t. to confirm (something done or promised), esp. formally, to ratify a treaty [F. ratifier] ratine (ration) n. ratine

rati-né (ræt'néi) n. a coarse woolen, cotton or rayon cloth, woven so as to have a rough, knotted surface [F.=tufted]

rating (réitin) n. a man's class in a warship's crew, or in the army  $\|(Br)$  a sailor below commissioned rank  $\|$  classification, e.g. of engines by horsepower, yachts by tonnage etc. | (com-merce) the estimated credit and reliability of a business concern | an estimate of achievement, status etc.  $\|(Br.)\|$  the amount fixed as a rate to

be paid on property
ratio (réificu, réifou) n. the relation between
two quantities which is expressed by dividing the magnitude of one by that of the other, the ratio between selling price and cost price is 3 to 1 [L.=reason]

ratioc-inate (ræsi:osineit) pres. part. ratioc-i-nating past and past part. ratioc-inated v.i. (rhet.) to reason, argue logically [fr. L. ratiocinari (ratiocinatus)]

ra-ti-oc-i-na-tion (ræfi:psinéi[an) n. (rhet.) the reasoning process [fr. L. ratiocinatio (ratiocinationis)]

ra-ti-oc-i-na-tive (ræʃi:ósineitiv) adj. (rhet.) of or marked by ratiocination [fr. L. ratiocinati-

ration (ræfən, réifən) 1. n. an amount (of food time etc.) which one permits oneself or which one is permitted  $\parallel(pl.)$  provisions (esp. of food or drink) allotted 2. v.t. to fix the amount of (something) which each individual is permitted to consume | to allow to consume only a certain amount of something || (with 'out') to give out as a ration [F. or fr. L. ratio (rationis), ratio] rational (ræfjan') adj. of or relating to reason || based on and in accordance with reason or rea-

based on and in accordance with reason or reasoning | well suited to its purpose, rational dress | endowed with reason, man is a rational animal | (pop.) sensible, sound-minded | (math.) not requiring a radical for its expression [fr. L. rationalis]

ra-tion-ale (ræsənæl) n. the logical justifying grounds for something | a statement or exposi-tion of principles or reasons [L. neut. of ratio-

nalis, rational)

ra-tion-al-ism (ræfən'lizəm) n. the belief that all knowledge and truth consist in what is ascertainable by rational processes of thought and that there is no supernatural revelation (philos.) the doctrine that true and absolute knowledge is found only in reason rational ist

snowledge is found only in reason rational-ist adj. and n. rational-istc adj. rational-ity (rafsmæliti:) n. the quality or state of being rational [fr. L.L. rationalitus] rational-ization (rafsn'lizeifsn) n. a rationalizing or the result of this || (business) reducing costs of industrial production to meet competition sen in world markets.

rational-ize (rafjorlaiz) pres. part. rational-ize la past and past part. rational-ized v.t. to discover and express the reason for (conduct exc.), esp. in order to justify || to put a natural explanation in place of a supernatural one for (something) || to make (a production or an industry) more efficient and less costly || (math.) to reduce\(^{\alpha}\) an expression) to finite terms

Ratis-bon (rætizbson) \*REGENSBURG ratite (rætait) 1. adj. of a member of Ratitae, a group of flightless, running birds with a flat sternum and rudimentary wings (e.g. emu, ostrich) 2. n. a member of Ratitae [fr. L. ratis,

rabline (rætlin) n. (naut., esp. pl.) one of the small lines rope across the shrouds of a ship, forming a ladder || the thin rope so used || (mil.) an organized effort for clandestine movement of personnel and/or material across a denied area

or border [etym. doubtful] rate-morphic (rætemórfik) adj. research conclusions based on the reactions of rats

ra-toon, rat-toon (rætú:n) 1. n. a new shoot growing from the root or crown of a perennial, e.g. sugarcane, after the old growth has been cut down 2. v.i. to send up new shoots in this

way | v.t. to cut back (a plant) to encourage rations to sprout [fr. Span. retoio, a sprout] rat race (pop.) a hectic rush, frantic scramble (used esp. of the struggle to earn a living in an industrial economy under conditions which tend to dehumanize)

rat racer n. (colloq.) participant in competitive society

rattan, ratan (rætæn) n. any of various climbing palms, esp. of genera Calamus and Dae-monothops, growing in India and S.E. Asia || a part of the long stem of this plant used for wickerwork, chair seats, rope etc. || a walking stick fashioned from such a stem [Malay rotan fr.

ratter (ratter) n. a dog good at catching rats rattle (rattl) 1. v. pres. part. rattling past and past part. rattled v.i. to emit a rapid succession of short, sharp sounds, the shutter rattled in the wind || to move emitting such sounds, the old car rattled down the road || to move rapidly, the car rattled along at great speed || (often with 'on') to talk rapidly, incessantly and often rather foolishly || v.t. to cause (something) to make a rattling sound | (often with 'off') to express in rapid, usually emotionless, speech, he rattled off the poem | to cause to become confused and lacking in confidence, the questions rattled the witness 2. n. the sound made by something which rattles || such a sound made by something which rattles || such a sound made in a mucus-clogged throat || a contrivance or baby's toy designed to make this sound || the horny rings on a rattlesnake's tail [M.E. ratelen, prob.

rattle-brain (ræt'lbrein) n. an emptyheaded person rat-tle-brained adj.

raut, to pare)

rattler (rætler) n. a rattlesnake rattle-snake (ræt'lsneik) n. a member of Sis-trurus or Crotalus, fam. Crotalidae, genera of North American poisonous snakes having horny sheaths towards the end of the tail which make a rattling sound

rattle trap (rattlesp) 1. n. something old and dilapidated, esp. a noisy, rattling automobile, wagon etc. || (Br., old-fash.) someone who chat-

ters incessantly 2. adj. old and dilapidated rattling (rætlin) adj. (pop.) decidedly good, a rattling success || (pop.) lively, brisk, a rattling

rattly (rætli:) adj. tending to rattle | having a noisy sound like a rattle rattoon \*RATOON

rat-trap, rat-trap (rættræp) n. a trap for catching rats

rau-cous (rókəs) adj. hoarse, grating, rough-sounding, raucous laughter [fr. L. raucus] raun-chy (rontsi:) adj. bawdy -raunchiness

Rau-schen-berg (raufenbeirg), Robert (1925-), U.S. painter, known esp. for his 'combine-drawings' depicting themes drawn from American folklore and using a juxtaposition of col-lage, ink, pencil and photography

rav-age (ravid3) n. devastation | (pl.) ill effects, the ravages of time [F.]

ravage of time [F.]
ravage pres. part. ravaging past and past
part. ravaged v.t. to lay waste to || v.i. to do
ruinous damage [F. ravager]
rave (reiv) 1. v.i. pres. part. raving past and
past part. raved to talk or act wildly or incoherently, he raved in his delirium || (with 'about' or
'over') to express or 'feel exaggerated admiration the raves about that interest in the present of the part of tion, she raves about that singer | v.t. to express wildly or incoherently, to rave obscenities 2. n. the act of raving or an instance of this || (pop.) an

excessively enthusiastic criticism, esp. of a play [perh. O.F. raver]

Ra-vel (rævel), Maurice (1875-1937), French composer. He explored a highly chromatic and sensuous harmony. His art is rigorously pre-cise, but also full of tenderness and fantasy, e.g. 'Ma mère l'Oye' (1908) and the operas l'Heure espagnole' (1907) and l'Enfant et les sortilèges' (completed in 1928). His mastery of orchestration, e.g. the suites from the ballet Daphnis and Chloe' (1908), is famous. Other works in-clude the piano suite 'Gaspard de la nuit' (1908), two piano concertos, chamber music and

songs ravel (rævəl) 1. v. pres. part. rav-el-ing, esp. Br. rav-el-ling past. and past part. rav-eled, esp. Br. rav-elled v.t. to separate the threads of || to cause (the edge of a fabric) to fray || v.i. to become tangled or confused || to become untwisted || to fray 2. n. a frayed end or loose thread || something tangled, esp. a tangled situ-

CONCISE PRONUNCIATION KEY: (a) æ, cat; a, car; ɔ fawn; ei, snake. (e) e, hen; it, sheep; iə, deer; ɛə, bear. (i) i, fish; ai, tiger; ə:, bird. (o) o, ox; au, cow; ou, goat; u, poor; ɔi, royal. (u) A, duck; u, bull; u:, goose; ə, bacillus; ju;, cube. x, loch; θ, think; δ, bother; z, Zen; 3, corsage; d3, savage; η, orangutang; j, yak; ʃ, fish; tf, fetch; 'l, rabble; 'n, redden. Complete pronunciation key appears inside front cover.